

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE  
April 9, 1965

The University Senate met on Friday, April 9, 1965, Acting President Colclough presiding. The first item on the agenda was the approval of the minutes of the last meeting. Mr. Reesing, Chairman of the University Objectives Committee stated that the amendment to the last minutes should have read "Delete the 2nd and 3rd sentence in Paragraph 1, Page 2. With this amendment the minutes were approved as circulated.

Acting President Colclough reported some of the decisions reached by the Board of Trustees at its meeting on March 18, 1965, among which were 1) an increase from 34 to 40 in the number of Trustee Scholarships available to students; one-half to be awarded to Washington area students and one-half awarded on a national scale. (These would not necessarily be full-time tuition scholarships in all cases, but rather based on financial need); 2) the establishment of the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching; 3) approval of the allowance of a three-hour tuition-free course each semester to all full-time faculty members, subject to the approval of the dean of the particular school or college; 4) approval of the proposed amendments to the Faculty Organization Plan as recommended by the Special Committee to Review the Plan and adopted by the Faculty Assembly at its meeting on February 9, 1965; 5) receipt and reply to the Resolution presented to the University Senate on February 12, 1965 by the Committee on Appointments, Salaries, and Promotion Policies (including Fringe Benefits) and approved for presentation to the Board of Trustees through the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

This was followed by remarks by Acting President Colclough on the Student Leaders' letter. President Colclough outlined the background of events following the receipt of the letter from the student leaders to the Board of Trustees concerning problems of urgent interest to the student body. He related ten specific steps which the students regarded as appropriate remedies and the Board of Trustees' response. President Colclough stated he was deeply impressed by the rapport which had been achieved between the students and the members of the Administration who had talked with them and the channels of communication which had been opened between the students and the members of the Board of Trustees in their meeting.

Before the Presiding Officer introduced Mr. Skip Gnehm, President of the Student Council, to the Senate, the Chairman of the Executive Committee welcomed the student leader and said a few words of thanks to Mr. Gnehm for calling upon him on the day the letter was circulated in order to brief him on the background of the students' action. Mr. Kraus expressed his satisfaction with Mr. Gnehm's acceptance of his invitation to appear before the Senate. This was to provide him with the opportunity to explain the state of student opinion and the nature of their grievances before the representatives of the Faculty. Mr. Gnehm, who was accompanied by the Secretary of the Student Council, Miss Marietta Bernot, restated some of the student problems set forth in their letter and remarked that although the students were impressed by the reception of their letter and the frank and helpful discussions they had had with all concerned, they would not rest until there was some evidence that some of their suggestions were beginning to lead to effective action. He suggested that, although the students were aware of the various obstacles and problems, a target date for "showing some positive gains" would be set by the students for November or December of next year. Mr. Gnehm's statement was followed by applause from the Senate. After some further friendly discussion of Mr. Gnehm's statements, Mr. Seidelson moved the following resolution be adopted and that it be sent to all members of the Board of Trustees and to the 53 student leaders who had signed the original letter:

R E S O L U T I O N

The members of the University Senate having received and read copies of a communication sent to the Board of Trustees over the signatures of 53 students in positions of leadership in the student body, express their agreement that there is a need for constantly improving communications among the parts of the University body: the students, the faculty, the administration and the Board of Trustees.

Moreover the University Senate commends the vigorous, but responsible manner in which the students have made known their desire for consideration on the matters set forth in the communication.

The Senate concurs with the students in concluding that the major objectives set forth in that communication require immediate attention, and to that end, the Senate is pleased to note that certain members of the Board of Trustees already have met with a group of the students responsible for the communication, that the Board's Committee on Extra-Curricular Activities contemplates inviting a group of student leaders and administration officers to meet with him regularly throughout the academic year. It is the hope of the Senate that these measures will result in prompt action on the objectives set forth in the communication, and will be carried on on a continuing basis.

The Senate is firmly convinced that the continuing acceleration of growth in the number of full-time, on-campus students carries with it as a necessary concomitant, the obligation of effecting an accelerated program of providing for and making available to the University's students appropriate physical facilities, feasible economic planning and a stimulating intellectual environment. Such a program is a requisite for the attainment and maintenance of a fulfilled and ever-improving student body. The elements of such a program are a vital part of a great university.

The Senate is pleased and encouraged by the evidence manifested in the student's communication that the students recognize their important role in the University's development, and believes that continued recognition of that role by all parts of the University and continuing and accelerated efforts by all parts of the University to achieve the objectives noted above will sustain and enhance the University's claim to greatness.

The motion was seconded, and carried, and the Acting President thanked the student leaders for their appearance at the Senate, whereupon Mr. Gnehm and Miss Bernot retired.

Mr. Naeser, Chairman of the Nominating Committee to Nominate an Executive Committee for the Academic Year 1965/66, then presented the following slate and moved its adoption:

Reuben E. Wood, Chairman	Chemistry
Frank N. Miller, Jr.	Medicine
Glen E. Weston	Law
Robert B. Heller	Engineering
Edwin L. Stevens	Speech
Oswald Colclough, Acting President	
Ex Officio	

The motion was seconded, unanimously carried and the Executive Committee was so constituted for the academic year 1965/66.

Mr. Robert Heller, Chairman of the Committee on Appointments, Salaries, and Promotion Policies (including Fringe Benefits) presented a statement in reply to the response of the Board of Trustees to the Committee's Resolution approved by the University Senate on February 12, 1965 and presented to the Board at its meeting on March 18, 1965. After considerable discussion and a series of motions, substitute motions, and suggestions for tabling of motions, with regard to the disposition of the statement, offered in turn by Mr. Stevens, Mr. Ledakis, Mr. Sharpe, Mr. Crafton, and Dr. Wise, Mr. Kraus, Chairman of the Executive Committee, moved a substitute resolution:

"The Senate, while appreciating the sentiments expressed in the Board of Trustees' communication on salaries, expects that concrete and affirmative action on advancing salary levels will be taken by the Board with all deliberate speed. It hopes that there will be appropriate consultation of the Board with the Senate Committee."

After some further discussion, this motion was seconded and passed. Dr. Wise then moved that the original statement be received and the text not recorded in the minutes. This motion was likewise seconded and carried.

Mr. Peter Hill, on behalf of Mrs. Yakobson, Chairman of the Committee on Student Relations, presented the following recommendation with regard to the Student Leaders' letter to the Board of Trustees:

"The Senate Committee on Student Relations recommends that communications between the Trustees, the Administration, the Faculty and students be improved so that a repetition of student action on March 28, 1965, will not be thought necessary in the future."

On motion seconded and carried, this recommendation was adopted. The Acting President then relinquished the Chair to Vice President and Dean of Faculties Brown as the President was overdue at an emergency meeting of the Board of Trustees Committee on Buildings and Lands.

Mr. Reesing, Chairman of the Committee on University Objectives, read the Committee's Report on their discussion of the document, "Basic Considerations Underlying an Academic Plan." He pointed out that the report was complete with two exceptions, i.e. 1) "On one topic (Assistant) Dean Simons of the College of General Studies, wished to submit a minority report, and 2) certain discussions and actions are taking place within the School of Government, Business and International Affairs which make it seem wise to delay final comments on relevant paragraphs in the document. He made the following recommendations:

- "a. that the document, "Basic Considerations Underlying an Academic Plan," together with the comments on it offered in our report be made available to each member of the University Senate;
- b. that the Senate express to President Colclough and to the Board of Trustees its general concurrence with the document, "Basic Considerations," as the basis of the academic master plan, and its endorsement of our position with respect to that document;"
- c. that the faculty participate fully and continuously in every stage of the formal presentation of the University's academic plan (which we understand to be the next step)"

The entire report is attached to these minutes. After general discussion, motion was made, seconded, and carried that the report be received by the Senate. A second motion was made, seconded, and approved that copies of the document under discussion in this report be made available to the Senate members.

On behalf of the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics, Mr. J. Forrester Davison (who is hospitalized), Mr. Kraus made a brief statement regarding this Committee's activities. He mentioned that a sample poll of student opinion had been arranged for the purpose of determining on an objective

basis student attitudes toward recreational and athletic activities. Because of the difficulties in arranging a meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee to prepare a formal report, a postponement was requested for a special meeting of the Senate to be called prior to the final meeting in May. On motion seconded and approved, the request for a special meeting was approved, the meeting to be set for 3 pm on a day designated by the Executive Committee.

The Report of the Library Committee was presented by Mr. Nimer, Chairman. The Chairman stated that this was not a formal report but rather a series of suggestions to elicit some comments and proposals from the Senate at large. He reiterated last year's committee statement that the effort to improve the capacity of the University as a center of learning can succeed only if, among other things, a much stronger University library system is created. The Committee discussed briefly the question of relations between the main library and present and prospective School and Departmental libraries, but its attention had been given primarily to the condition and future of the Main library. The Committee urged that consideration be given promptly to making the space in the basement and on the upper three floors of the library building which is presently used for other purposes available to the library. The space which the Library would acquire would be lost to other present users. Thus, full use by the library of its present building must be considered in the context of the University's overall pattern of space allocation. However, even were the library to fill all of the building in which it is now housed, it would not be physically adequate to the purpose of developing services necessary for first-class undergraduate and graduate learning. For, these services require not only space for much more substantial holdings and modern processing equipment, but a design more suitable than the present building for freer, direct yet secure, student access to materials. Hence, University development plans should provide for a new library building to be constructed as soon as possible. The Committee envisages expansion within the present structure as merely a short-term remedy. Concomitantly with this short-term enlargement of the main library's quarters, the Committee urged the following steps for improvement of library service:

- "1) Enlargement of the library staff, including especially additional professionally qualified persons. Specific mention may be made of the need for competent bibliographers to carry through a survey of present holdings. Indispensable to such staff expansion is a marked upgrading of salary levels for both professional and non-professional staff.
- "2) The institution of a procedure of systematic weeding of collections, a desirable thing in itself and especially urgent for our library in view of the severe shortage of space.
- "3) The acquisition of such mechanical and electronic processing equipment as the Librarian may deem useful and compatible with other equally important uses of available funds.



- "4) A marked increase in the allotment of funds for the purchase of books, periodicals and other printed matter.
- "5) Establishment of an acquisitions policy. This would require faculty participation, perhaps department-by-department.
- "6) The Librarian should be empowered to enrich and develop collections without being bound to specific faculty recommendations. This is in addition to the usual purchase of materials in response to departmental orders.
- 7) The University Library should secure the status of a U. S. Government Depository . . . the librarian of the Law School has made a particular point of this need, but it is an acquisition which clearly would serve many other units of the University.

"The effectuation of the above recommendations will come after Mr. John Russell Mason, who after many years of conscientious service, expects to retire prior to the beginning of the next academic year. And since the Committee has a part to play in the appointment of a Librarian, it has also discussed the kind of background which a Librarian might be expected to bring to a post whose duties would be modified by the expansion of library service which we are recommending."

Vice President Brown congratulated Mr. Nimer on the "specifics" contained in this committee statement and in this context mentioned that he had just today received the report of Mr. Mason Tolman who has made a survey of the University from an outside-the-university point of view and many of his recommendations had closely paralleled those listed in the report of the Library Committee. Mr. Kraus urged that thought be given to the possibility of appointing a faculty member or other scholar to the post of Library Director supported by a (professional) Executive or Associate Librarian, a solution which had been adopted by such leading universities as Harvard and Michigan. Dr. Wise then moved that the Senate unanimously concur with this statement and "feel a sense of urgency toward presenting it to the Board of Trustees." The motion was seconded and carried.

Mr. Kraus strongly urged that the various committees submit their annual reports to him no later than April 20 as they will be the basis for the annual report of the outgoing Executive Committee at the regularly scheduled May meeting of the Senate.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Frederick R. Houser  
Secretary,  
University Senate

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington D. C.

March 3, 1965

TO MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY

The University Senate will have its regular meeting on Friday, March 12, 1965 at 2 p.m. in the Faculty Conference Room on the fifth floor of the Library Building.

- Agenda:
- 1) Approval of the minutes of the last meeting.
  - 2) Election of a committee to nominate the Executive Committee for the academic year 1965/66.
  - 3) Preliminary report from the Sub-Committee on Retirement - Mr. Everett Johnson.
  - 4) Remarks from the Chairman of the Committee on Faculty Performance - Mr. Naeser.
  - 5) Statement from the Chairman of the Committee on Administrative Matters - Miss St. Cyr.
  - 6) Remarks from the Chairman of the Executive Committee.

by direction of the Chairman of the Executive Committee.

Frederick R. Houser  
Secretary of the Senate

Mr. Houser:

Minutes of the Senate for Feb. 12, 1965  
should be corrected to read "Assistant  
Dean Simons" -- not "Dean Simons".

*Red in mail  
unsigned*

MEMORANDUM

9 April 1965

TO: Professor Kraus, Chairman  
Executive Committee, University Senate

The Committee on University Objectives submits herewith to the University Senate a report on discussions of the document, "Basic Considerations Underlying an Academic Plan." The report is complete except for two items, as follows:

1. On one topic Dean Simons wishes to submit a minority report. It will take the form of a report on "The Problems of Quality in the College of General Studies" which he is preparing for the office of the Dean of Faculties. A copy of it will be provided to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy so that there may be a full discussion of these questions by the Senate at the time the Educational Policy Committee makes its report; and we shall wish to attach a copy of his statement, when it is ready, to the report we are now submitting.

2. Certain discussions and actions proceeding within the School of Government, Business and International Affairs at the time we have been holding our own discussions make it seem wise to delay our final comments on the relevant paragraphs of "Basic Considerations" (p.15) until later in this spring semester. We do now have one brief item on page 1 of the Appendix to our report; but we consider that as tentative, and we should like to reserve the option of submitting an alternative statement a few weeks hence.

In all other respects, however, we are now ready to submit our report, and we do so with three recommendations:

a. that the document, "Basic Considerations Underlying an Academic



Plan," together with the comments on it offered in our report, be made available to each member of the University Senate;

- b. that the Senate express to President Colclough and to the Board of Trustees its general concurrence with the document, "Basic Considerations," as the basis of the academic master plan, and its endorsement of our position with respect to that document;
- c. that the faculty participate fully and continuously in every stage of the formal preparation of the University's academic plan (which we understand to be the next step).

Respectfully submitted,

Frank D. Allan

Harold P. Green

Howard M. Merriman

Albert C. Murdaugh

Richard B. Simons

John P. Reesing, Jr., Chairman

## REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVES

9 April 1965

In a memorandum of February 8, 1965, addressed to Professor Reesing as chairman of the Senate Committee on University Objectives, Vice-President Brown wrote as follows: "After consultation with Mr. Kraus, who informs me that the Senate Executive Committee wishes your committee to be the one to advise the administration in the final stages of the formulation of an academic plan, I am pleased to transmit to you a copy of the document entitled 'Basic Considerations Underlying an Academic Plan!.'" Mr. Brown stated further that Acting President Colclough, "who authorized the report hereby transmitted, requests the advice of your committee and hopes for prompt and deliberate consideration, for the completion of our long-range planning is a matter requiring our best immediate efforts."

In accordance with that mandate, our committee has held weekly discussion meetings, beginning on Tuesday, 9 February, and concluding on Tuesday, 6 April. We have examined the document sentence by sentence. We have had the opportunity for full, free, and frank discussion. We have enjoyed the benefit of several meetings with Vice-President Brown; and Professor Reuben Wood, as a member of the Executive Committee of the Senate, has favored us by attending two of our meetings. On the basis of all that study and discussion, we now submit our report.

We desire, first of all, unanimously and enthusiastically to endorse the spirit in which the document was prepared and written. It identifies, honestly and bravely, all the major problems that our University now faces, at this particular moment in her long and honorable history. We look upon this diagnostic activity as the indispensable first step toward the correction of

certain difficulties under which all the members of our University labor; and we take this opportunity to express our gratitude to President Colclough for commissioning, and to Vice-President Brown and all our other deans for preparing, such a penetrating, constructive, and hopeful contribution toward an academic master plan.

We acknowledge at once that all the creative work was done by those who prepared the document; our own discussions have been mainly analytical and amplificatory. Together we represent every component of the University, and every member of our Committee recognizes all the problems; a large part of our discussion has consisted simply in comment from each of us, one by one, about the way each problem manifests itself in that part of the University which each of us knows best. We ourselves have turned up no major issues not raised by the document. We consider it to be a comprehensive summary of all the major problems and difficulties.

We unanimously agree, further, that the document exaggerates nothing. All the problems discussed in it are real, and they call for immediate attention. We share profoundly the same sense of urgency that the deans have expressed in their document.

We also endorse the idea, implicit throughout the document and frequently explicit, that the University must now strive for national and international greatness. We recognize very clearly what the costs and hazards of trying to realize such an aspiration must be. Fully aware of the difficulties to be faced, we say, deliberately and solemnly, that nothing less than this ideal

will satisfy our faculty and students. Nor will anything less than greatness be worthy of the excellent tradition bequeathed to us by our predecessors, from whom we who serve the University in this generation have inherited so much of the inestimable value upon which to build.

In the pages appended to our report we offer some comments on a number of details, with the hope that the qualifications, amplifications, and emphases we suggest may prove helpful in preparing the ultimate academic plan. We should like to devote the rest of our basic report to a somewhat more extended discussion of four major items about which we at first found ourselves in some disagreement (in varying degrees). After much thought, and after leisured discussion, we are now able to offer something close to a unanimous report on the first three; on the fourth item we find it necessary to include a minority report.

(1) Pages 14-15, "The Centrality of the Liberal Arts."

At the start, some among us felt uneasy about the implications of the term "centrality." Discussion revealed that all fears would be allayed by the addition of this clarifying sentence: 'The term "centrality" as used in this section has reference to academic philosophy and to organizational structure and function; it carries no implications concerning priority schedules or the size of liberal arts student body and faculty.' We offer this sentence simply as clarification, NOT as a minimizing qualification of the philosophy asserted in this section of the document. That philosophical position we firmly and unanimously endorse.

(2) Page 41, on the relative proportion of graduate to undergraduate

students. We do not feel ourselves in a position to suggest an appropriate formula, nor do we all take precisely the same position on this general question. We are, however, firmly agreed on the following items:

a. The number of faculty members engaged in teaching and/or directing graduate students is the primary factor for determining the number of graduate students that a university can appropriately admit, and thus for working out a viable ratio of graduate to undergraduate students.

b. In the light of that principle, the University now has far too many graduate students. The implication is clear: either we should drastically reduce the amount of graduate work we are now offering, or we must immediately undertake a massive program for enlarging the graduate faculty.

(3) Pages 32-33, on academic policy concerning part-time students and their relation to full-time students.

We are in sympathy with the qualitative aims generally implied in these paragraphs of the document, although some members of our Committee do not entirely agree with the principles there asserted. We can offer three comments:

a. We unanimously agree that, the proportion of full-time to part-time students being what it now is, no full-time day student should have to take any of the courses for his degree program in the evening.

b. In the light of the University's historic policy with respect to part-time students and the outstanding academic success we have enjoyed through that policy, all of us on the Committee believe that the essential distinction to be made among our students is not between full and part-time but between degree and non-degree students. It may very well be that, in some cases at least, non-degree students should be separated from those studying for degrees. However, all of us have experienced the quality of part-time students in degree programs; they often possess a maturity, and introduce into their classes a kind of stimulation, that younger students cannot provide but can profit from. We are therefore not convinced that part-time degree students should necessarily be separated from full-time degree students, and we certainly do not believe that academic standards (for classroom performance, papers, and examinations) should be lower for part-time than for full-time degree students. Indeed, we see no reason why the standards for the two categories of degree students should differ at all, and we are therefore made uncomfortable by the statement that the part-time student "deserves to be . . . measured against different objectives" (p. 33) -- although of course we recognize that the preceding sentence accurately states some important facts: "He is not primarily a student, not able to participate in campus life, not free to spend as much time in library and research activity."

c. Also, the statement that the part-time student "deserves to be paced at a different level" (p.33) has made some of us uneasy because



"different" might imply 'lower', or 'less challenging.' Others among us have felt that no such weakening implication need be understood but that, rather, our part-time students possessing the academic quality we know they possess, "different" may mean 'more difficult, more challenging.'

(4) The nature and volume of the extension work conducted by the College of General Studies is the fourth item, and the one on which we have not been able to resolve some of our basic philosophic disagreements. Four comments may suggest the range of attitudes within the Committee:

a. Certainly all of us agree that the University has been well advised to accept as one of her responsibilities the enlargement of her influence upon the community through the medium of courses of instruction systematically offered on an extension basis.

b. The majority of us believe, however, that for the present at least, at this stage in the University's development, the extension program is very much too large. The majority consider that the University's academic resources are grossly over-extended, and we should hope for an immediate scaling down.

c. The majority of the Committee strongly doubt that there can be justification for this University's offering, through an extension program, courses leading to graduate degrees. The chairman and one other member of the Committee are firmly convinced that there can be no justification for such courses.

d. The document we have been examining was written, clearly, on

the assumption that the essential activity of the University is that which takes place on our campus, that total academic life which professors, students, and administrative officers together cultivate in our campus environment. The majority of the Committee endorse this assumption, and its corollary: that extension work must inevitably be peripheral. That position, however, is firmly denied by Dean Simons, on the basis of very different philosophic assumptions. On this fourth point, then, the nature and extent of the program conducted by CGS, Dean Simons will submit a minority report (see our covering memorandum, addressed to Professor Kraus). This, however, is the only major item on which, now that our discussions are concluded, we find that we cannot entirely agree.

We wish, though, to end our report on a more harmonious note, a general observation in which we all join with enthusiastic unanimity. Together we represent an aggregate of seventy years of service on the University Faculty. We have a thorough and intimate knowledge of our University. We know what her problems are, and we know how serious they are. This document identifies them with very precise accuracy, and it does not exaggerate them. If within our century the University is going to realize her potential, vigorous and creative attention must be given to every one of the problems, and the work must begin at once. We wish to conclude by underscoring our own sense of urgency, even impatience; there is not a minute to lose.

To President Colclough and to the Executive Committee of the University Senate we express our thanks for doing us the honor of requesting our comments and advice on the document. To Vice-President Brown and all our other deans we express our admiration for a job superlatively well done; we are delighted to give our professorial endorsement to the spirit and, within the qualifications we have indicated, to the philosophy of the document they have composed. Very deliberately, after sober and prolonged reflection, we express our judgment that no more important contribution toward the overall advancement of the University has been made within the experience of any of us since we joined the Faculty than the document we were commissioned to examine.

## APPENDIX

- p. 4, last sentence: We agree in principle, but we want to emphasize that learned persons are the very heart of a university and learned persons are not necessarily effective fund-raisers. We should deplore the development of an ethos here in which guilt feelings might be forced upon a great scholar simply because he felt unable to participate in fund-raising.
- p. 7, last sentence, "equivalent ones taken off campus": Dean Simons expresses the dissenting comment that some off-campus courses can be better than the corresponding on-campus ones.
- p. 9, middle paragraph, sentence beginning "We shall strengthen ourselves":  
Yes, indeed. Unanimously we should wish to stress this assertion.
- p. 13, last sentence: We understand the phrase "a narrower band of university activities" to refer exclusively to exotic, highly specialized ones. We emphasize our understanding that the phrase definitely does NOT point to anything less than a full university curriculum.
- p. 15, last paragraph, "the School," etc., "That school" (our italics):  
There is much ferment among the faculty, some of whom at least envision the possibility of two schools. We regret that this section of the document does not take into account that very definite possibility. ✓ We may wish to substitute another statement; see our covering memorandum. ✓
- p. 16, second paragraph, first sentence: Possibly overstated, as far as the

present state of affairs is concerned; but we should hope that the development and strengthening of these ties might be systematically encouraged.

- p. 16, last sentence: One of our number objects to the word "major," as an overstatement; another would emphasize the words "potentialities" and "suggest."
- p. 17, end of section on "Professional Education -- A Special Challenge" (beginning on p. 15): We feel that this section as a whole is excellent as far as it goes; but we regret that certain professional categories seem not to have been brought within its purview: e.g., chemistry, physics, history, geology, and other liberal arts areas.
- p. 18, first sentence: A statement that is probably not adequate to all that has preceded.
- p. 18, last sentence: We are very dubious about the advisability of depending very much, for programs under the Graduate Council, upon part-time staff members, no matter how splendidly qualified they may be professionally.
- p. 19, item #1: "Limited" suggests weaknesses that should not be exposed in any published version of this document.

"... joint or shared . . . . appointments": We recommend extreme caution with respect to these ideas. Most professors will feel the need for identification with one particular institution; we believe that the ideas expressed in this sentence may threaten a certain rootlessness that most scholars would want to avoid.

- p. 19, item #2: The phrase "less fortunate in location" may seem somewhat untactful, in any published version.

At least one of our number feels that liaisons with other institutions are secondary and peripheral, and tend to dilute our own efforts.

- p. 20, last paragraph, "the part-time faculty": This general term may include several very different categories, the distinctions among which it would be well to keep in mind: (a) graduate students teaching an elementary course, (b) an accomplished scholar teaching a large and popular course for us on a part-time appointment, (c) a scholar teaching a rare specialty, and (d) a professor retired from another institution who joins us as a part-time colleague, say for a year or so.

- p. 20, last paragraph, "syllabi": We are uncertain as to what "syllabi" refers to, and we are concerned that the implication may be that everyone teaching a course may be expected to teach it in precisely the same way.

- p. 21, first paragraph: We urge a concerted and energetic prosecution of the potential for a sense of community among us.

In certain components of the University there may be a need for more frequent, and regular, faculty meetings.

- p. 21, second sentence, "Further improvement of the faculty club": We need a new faculty club.

- p. 21, Item #4: "full-time participation" needs precise definition. For any



one faculty member, how many committee assignments? how many graduate advisees? how many theses to direct? etc.

p. 22, first paragraph: We suggest that line 5 be changed to read, "graduate assistants, and in many cases relief from student-counselling overloads."

p. 22, next-to-last paragraph: "enhance the control," yes: "increase the participation of" -- we are dubious. Departments do not recommend the appointment of scholars, and scholars do not accept faculty appointments, for the purpose of working with television and films. Learned persons must not be made to feel guilty if they decline to 'serve the University' by entertaining or even edifying the public on television, etc. -- Nor do we feel that students themselves would welcome television instruction as adequate.

p. 23, item #6: Obviously our salary scale must be upgraded, and the need is greatest in the top ranks. We assume equitable treatment among the various disciplines.

p. 24, item b: Good -- and this scale should be periodically reevaluated.

p. 24, footnote, "larger classes where there would not be a demonstrable loss of quality": We should want to hear the deans' ideas on how this can be accomplished. The chief factors are

- (a) the discipline involved;
- (b) the level of the course;
- (c) the fruitful interchange of ideas; above a certain maximum (30? 40? 45?) this conversational interchange becomes impossible;

(d) the grading of student essays and examinations. Some of us, at least, feel that the most valuable single part of the discipline we experienced as students was the writing of essays. But a professor can grade only so many papers. Large classes therefore presuppose an ample number of adequately compensated graduate assistants.

p. 25, item #9, first sentence: We do not dissent, from this or from the general tenor of the whole paragraph, but we do feel that the first sentence is probably too sweeping. The formality of classroom lectures provides an important value. Some professors are excellent lecturers, but less good as tutors -- and vice versa. We suggest that a faculty performs best in an atmosphere that combines the formalities of certain occasions with the kind of informal context that the paragraph as a whole is outlining. With that qualification understood, we enthusiastically endorse the sentiment.

Two other comments here: (a) We would hope that, as the complexity of our University increases, and especially as more and more senior men become involved with graduate and post-Ph.D. students, we would not lose sight of the policy that has worked so well here for so long, that of having top professors teach in the introductory courses taken by freshmen and sophomores. (b) We firmly support the idea in the sentence, "They suggest more emphasis," etc., and take note of the fact that such desirable media for education are extremely expensive. Perhaps they may provide ways of making up for some of the deficiencies

concomitant with the enlargement of certain classes that is advocated on page 24.

p. 26, last paragraph: Cf. our comment re p. 20, naming the various categories of part-time faculty.

p. 26, last paragraph, second sentence: We understand "size" to mean percentage.

P. 26, last sentence: This might be recast, to clear up the awkward negative at the end.

p. 27, first paragraph: This idea has elicited unusually cordial response in our Committee; we would like to see it emphasized.

p. 27, second paragraph: We agree that departments should have responsibility, and we urge that they be given commensurate authority.

p. 28, We firmly support the proposal to upgrade the student body by raising admissions standards. At the same time, we express the desirability of achieving a well-balanced student body.

p. 29, middle paragraph, and the two recommendations: We agree, and offer two comments: (a) There should be cut-off dates for accepting applications for admission, and (b) we should strive to attract a larger percentage of students from the top ten per cent of their high-school classes.

Some of us have expressed an interest in the possibility of involving students in the recruitment process. Also, concern has been expressed that the University do everything appropriate for insuring that our students, especially the superior ones, remain with us once they matriculate.

- p. 30, first paragraph, last sentence: We all respond sympathetically to this idea, and one among us particularly wishes to place a strong emphasis on the idea of "shared responsibility."
- p. 31, second paragraph: Some members of the Committee feel that we have tended to be too accommodating in our admission standards for foreign students. We unanimously support the principle that the number and percentage of foreign students should be increased; we also agree that such students should be treated academically by the same standards as American students.
- p. 36, second sentence: There may be certain ambiguities here that need clarifying: "rare" books -- yes, unnecessary to duplicate; "highly specialized material" may be needed in our own library.

We firmly support the next sentence, "But there is no substitute," and we would like to push the idea of specialized libraries for the different disciplines.

- p. 41, top paragraph: Yes. Emphasize this.
- p. 42, top paragraph: Some of us feel very uneasy about "computerized instruction"; we are not convinced that that would be consistent with our stated objective of excellence. But of course the sentence says, "We must investigate," etc., and certainly we have no objection to that. We underscore the point that first-class people are required for the operation of "programmed text materials."

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington 6, D. C.

5 April 1965

SUPPLEMENT TO AGENDA SENT TO YOU  
ON 2 APRIL 1965

TO MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE:

This is to advise that Election of the Executive Committee for the Academic Year 1965/66 will be held at the regular meeting of the University Senate on Friday, April 9, 1965 at 2 p.m. in the Faculty Conference Room on the fifth floor of the Library Building.

By direction of the Chairman of the Executive Committee.

*Frederick R. Houser*  
Frederick R. Houser  
Secretary of the Senate

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington D. C.

TO MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE:

2 April 1965

The University Senate will have its regular meeting on Friday, April 9, 1965 at 2 p.m. in the Faculty Conference Room on the fifth floor of the Library Building.

- Agenda:
- 1) Approval of minutes of the last meeting.
  - 2) Remarks by Acting President Colclough on Student Leaders' Letter.
  - 3) Statement from Committee on Appointments, Salaries, and Promotion Policies (including Fringe Benefits) - Mr. Heller, Chairman.
  - 4) Report of the Committee on University Objectives - Mr. Reesing, Chairman.
  - 5) Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics - Mr. Davison, Chairman, (or Mr. Skinner, for the Chairman).
  - 6) Report of the Library Committee - Mr. Nimer, Chairman

By direction of the Chairman of the Executive Committee.

Frederick R. Houser  
Secretary of the Senate



University Senate

12 May 1965

Dr. O. S. Colclough  
Acting President  
The George Washington University  
Washington, D. C.

Dear President Colclough:

The following resolution was passed by the University Senate at its 9 April 1965 meeting for transmittal to the Board of Trustees through the Presiding Officer:

"The Senate, while appreciating the sentiments expressed in the Board of Trustees' communication on salaries, expects that concrete and affirmative action on advancing salary levels will be taken by the Board with all deliberate speed. It hopes that there will be appropriate consultation of the Board with the Senate Committee."

Very truly yours,

Frederick R. Houser  
Secretary  
University Senate

FRH:rb

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D. C.

April 1, 1965


TO MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE:

By direction of the Presiding Officer of the Senate, the following resolution, as adopted by the Board of Trustees at its meeting on March 18, 1965, in response to the resolution presented to the University Senate on February 12, 1965, by the Committee on Appointments, Salaries, and Promotion Policies (including Fringe Benefits) and adopted unanimously, is hereby transmitted to the members of the University Senate:

RESOLUTION

"The Board of Trustees has given consideration to the University Senate's resolution of February 12, 1965, concerning faculty salary policy which was submitted to the Board through the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

"The Board is in complete sympathy with the objectives stated in the Senate resolution and is doing everything it can to attain those objectives at the earliest date possible. The Board proposes to continue its policy of increasing salaries as the financial resources of the University will permit, and it is endeavoring by every reasonable means to increase those resources."

  
Frederick R. Houser,  
Secretary  
University Senate

FRH:rb

3 March 1965

Dr. O. S. Colclough  
Acting President  
The George Washington University  
Washington, D. C.

Dear President Colclough:

The following resolution was unanimously passed by the University Senate at its 12 February 1965 meeting with the recommendation that it be forwarded to the Board of Trustees at its 18 March 1965 meeting:

#### R E S O L U T I O N

"Even a university which is the only non-denominational private institution of higher learning in the Nation's Capital cannot achieve greatness when its salary scale is similar to that of fourth or fifth ranked institutions. Based upon information supplied by the University to the American Association of University Professors, the George Washington University is at the C level (fourth, coming after AA, A, and B) on the AAUP's average salary scale and at the D level (fifth) on the AAUP's minimum salary scale. As the Board of Trustees makes plans for the University's future, it must recognize that raising salary levels to the AAUP's A scales is a necessary condition to achieving greatness.

"The faculty realizes that this salary policy cannot be put into effect immediately. The first step in implementing the policy, however, should be the adoption of the AAUP's B minimum salary scale for the academic year 1965-66 and the adoption of a plan for annual salary increases to bring The George Washington University to the A minimum and average salary levels by the academic year 1970-71."

Very truly yours,

Frederick R. Houser, Secretary  
University Senate

FRH:rb